



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,903	03/03/2000	Shane M Rogers	NORT-0045-US(118569SCUS01	5600
7590	05/17/2005		EXAMINER	
Dan C Hu Trop Pruner & Hu PC 8554 Katy Freeway Suite 100 Houston, TX 77024			NGUYEN, STEVEN H D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2665	
			DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/517,903	ROGERS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Steven HD Nguyen	2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18,20-31 and 34-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18,20-31 and 34-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on 2/28/05, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. Korpi set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 5-11, 15-18, 20-24, 26-31, 34, 36-38, 41, 43-46 and 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry (USP 6078582) in view Korpi (USP 6636528).

Regarding claims 1-2, 20, 28, 31, 34, 36, 51-53 and 55, Curry discloses an apparatus for use in a telephony system comprising a digital interface for communicating with telephone (Fig 6, Ref 72A has an digital interface for communicating with telephone 64A); a packet interface for communicating with a packet-based network (Fig 72A has packet interface for communicating with internet 74); and a controller (Fig 7-8 has a controller for encapsulating the received signaling message into a internet packet for transmitting via internet, See Abstract and Fig 9A, Ref 130) to receive control information from the digital interface and to encapsulate the stimulus control information into one or more packets for transmission over the packet-based network through the packet interface. However, Curry does not disclose a stimulus telephone for generating a stimulus control information coupled a PBX. In the same field of endeavor, Korpi discloses a method and system for encapsulating the stimulus control information from the stimulus telephones for transmitting via Internet (See col. 2, lines 12-27, 40-48, col. 3, lines 27-45, col. 6, lines 25-39, the signaling unit 16 receives a stimulus command from control unit 16 and embedded into an internet packet for transmitting via packet network, Fig 2, Ref 16 for encapsulating stimulus command into packet).

Since, Curry discloses a system for interfacing between Internet and PSTN wherein PSTN includes PBX and Korpi discloses a PBX which includes a signaling unit for encapsulating/decapsulating between the first “stimulus” protocol and second protocol “packet

protocol". Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method and system for encapsulating the messages which received from the stimulus telephones for transmitting via Internet as disclosed Korpi's system and method into the method and system of Curry. The motivation would have been to reduce setup time and provide a direct communication path between the stimulus telephones via two different network protocols.

Regarding claim 5, Curry discloses the controller adds a destination address of a telephone switch system into the one or more packets (Col. 15, lines 15-44, IP address of destination gateway 72B).

Regarding claim 6, Curry discloses the controller adds a destination address of a stimulus telephone into the one or more packets (Col. 15, lines 15-44, calling number).

Regarding claims 7-11 and 22-24, Curry discloses the stimulus control information is according to a first stimulus language, and wherein the stimulus control information remains in the first stimulus language after encapsulation which performs by adding a header using TCI/IP protocol (Col. 15, lines 15-44, the received signaling message is encapsulated into IP packet without translating the received signaling message into a different form).

Regarding claims 15, 21, 29-30, 38, 46 and 54, Curry discloses comprising a receiver (Fig 6, Ref 72B) to receive the one or more packets, the receiver including an element to decapsulate the one or more packets to extract the control information for transmitting to interface which couples the telephone (Fig 9A, Ref 132, the destination gateway decapsulating the packet to obtain the signaling message for sending to the interface which couples to the telephones). However, Curry does not disclose a stimulus telephone for receiving a stimulus

control information from a PBX. In the same field of endeavor, Korpi discloses a method and system for decapsulating the stimulus control information from the internet packet for transmitting to the stimulus telephone (See col. 2, lines 12-27, 40-48, col. 3, lines 27-45, col. 6, lines 25-39, Fig 2, Ref 16 for decapsulating the internet packet for obtaining stimulus command for transmitting to the stimulus telephone).

Since, Curry discloses a system for interfacing between Internet and PSTN wherein PSTN includes PBX and Korpi discloses a PBX which includes a signaling unit for encapsulating/decapsulating between the first “stimulus” protocol and second protocol “packet protocol”. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method and system for decapsulating the encapsulating message from internet for transmitting to the stimulus telephones as disclosed Korpi’s system and method into the method and system of Curry. The motivation would have been to reduce setup time and provide a direct communication path between the stimulus telephones via two different network protocols.

Regarding claim 16, Curry discloses the receiver is associated with a second stimulus device, and wherein the extracted stimulus control information is in a native stimulus language of the second stimulus device (Fig 6, Ref 72B decapsulates the packet to obtain the signaling message and 64B is the second stimulus device).

Regarding claims 17-18, 37, 41 and 43-45, Curry discloses the stimulus control information includes at least one of hook state information and key press event information and a command selected from the group consisting of a handset volume control command, a handset

connect/disconnect command, and a ringer activation command which is encapsulated by the controller (Col. 14, lines 9-17 and Fig 9, 136 and 146).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry and Korpi in view of Chang (USP 6118864).

Regarding claim 3, Curry and Korpi fail to disclose the digital interface is UART or time compression multiplexing interface. However, in the same field of endeavor, Chang discloses an interface for SMDI is UART (Fig 1D wherein the central office or PBX is link with the gateway by UART interface 56 for transmitting the telephone number between them). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply UART into a gateway for receiving and transmitting a signal as disclosed by Chang into the method and system of Curry and Korpi in order to reduce cost.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry and Korpi in view of Nizamuddin (USP 5136585).

Regarding claim 4, Curry and Korpi fail to disclose the digital interface is UART. However, in the same field of endeavor, Nizamuddin discloses interface for connecting the telephones is TCM interface for receiving signal (FIG 1, Ref 12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply TCM interface into a gateway for receiving and transmitting a signal as disclosed Nizamuddin into the method and system of Curry and Korpi in order to provide a ping pong transmission.

7. Claims 12, 25, 39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry and Korpi in view of Verthein (USP 6487186).

Regarding claim 12, 25, 39 and 42, Curry and Korpi fail to disclose the claimed invention. However, in the same field of endeavor, Verthein discloses DTMF tone transmits via UDP channel (See col. 11, lines 9-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply an UDP header into receiving and transmitting a signal as disclosed by Verthein's system into the method and system of Curry and Korpi. The motivation would have been to turn the Internet into a telecommunication network.

8. Claims 13, 26 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry and Korpi in view of Naor (USP 6275573).

Regarding claims 13, 26 and 48, Curry and Korpi fail to disclose the claimed invention. However, in the same field of endeavor, Naor discloses a method and system for encrypting digits before transmitting (Fig 1, Ref 34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply encrypting circuit into a gateway as disclosed Naor's system into the method and system of Curry and Korpi. The motivation would have been to provide a reliable and security for packets which transmits via Internet.

9. Claims 13-14, 26-27 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry and Korpi in view of Wilkes (USP 6438124).

Regarding claims 13-14, 26-27 and 47-48, Curry and Korpi fail to disclose the claimed invention. However, in the same field of endeavor, Wilkes discloses the packet, which is transmitted via Internet, is digitized, compressed and encrypted (See Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply these scrambling or encrypting into a gateway for receiving and transmitting a signal as

disclosed by Wilkes into the method and system of Curry and Korpi. The motivation would have been to provide a reliable and security for packets which transmits via Internet.

10. Claims 35, 40 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry and Korpi in view of Kubler (USP 6389010).


Regarding claims 35, 40 and 49-50, Curry and Korpi fail to disclose an interface card adapted to be inserted into a slot of the stimulus telephone that comprises the digital interface and the packet interface and the controller. However, in the same field of endeavor, Kubler discloses integrate the digital interface and the packet interface and the controller into a circuit board for plug into a slot of telephone (Fig 57 and Col. 92, lines 30-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to integrate these component into a PCMCIA for inserting into a telephone slot as disclosed by Kubler into the method and system of Curry and Korpi. The motivation would have been reduce the cost of telephone call.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven HD Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3159. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy D. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Steven H.D. Nguyen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2665  
5/9/05



HUY D. VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600